PRAISE FOR THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

February 2000

A Fiscally Responsible Budget Without the Gimmicks

• New York Times: "A dose of reality"

"The budget was also significant for injecting a dose of reality into budget calculations. Mr. Clinton wisely called for scrapping the unrealistic spending caps enacted by Congress two and a half years ago, which would destroy domestic spending programs if they were ever adhered to. Congress has all but ignored these caps in the last two years, sometimes by employing gimmicks like labeling regular programs as "emergencies" and therefore outside the caps." [Editorial, New York Times, 2/8/2000]

• Los Angeles Times: "Restores credibility to the process"

"Moreover, it restores some credibility to the annual budget process by removing the gimmicks Congress resorted to in the current fiscal year in order to meet unrealistic spending limits. Clinton's fiscal 2001 budget proposal rightly acknowledges that the 1997 spending caps, which have been breached in all subsequent budgets, were never realistic and should not be used in future budgeting." [Editorial, Los Angeles Times, 2/8/2000]

• Atlanta Journal Constitution: Avoids "budget hocus pocus"

"Why is Clinton's [surplus] projection lower? Because he is realistic enough not to factor in the restrictive spending caps enacted in 1997, which Congress has avoided, using budget hocus-pocus such as designating a regular program as an 'emergency.' Congress should admit the caps are useless and scrap them." [Editorial, Atlanta Journal-Constitution, 2/9/2000]

• Newsday: "A welcome dose of realism"

"President Bill Clinton's \$ 1.84-trillion budget for the fiscal year beginning in October includes a welcome dose of realism about the size of the surplus and the fiction of spending caps." [Editorial, Newsday, 2/9/2000]

• St. Louis Post-Dispatch: "Good and sensible"

"Mr. Clinton did a good and sensible thing by recommending a proper burial of the unrealistic spending caps Congress cautiously enacted two and a half years ago." [Editorial, <u>St. Louis Post-Dispatch</u>, 2/9/2000]

Paying Down the Debt While Supporting Social Security and Medicare

- Christian Science Monitor: Debt, Medicare and Social Security Plans deserve support "The president's plan for debt liquidation by 2013 and shoring up Medicare and Social Security are easy steps that deserve wide support." [Editorial, Christian Science Monitor, 2/9/2000]
- Los Angeles Times: "Follows fiscally responsible line"

"Clinton's plan follows the fiscally responsible line of calling for current Social Security surpluses to be used to pay down the \$2.5-trillion national debt. It would also put \$299 billion of the \$746-billion non-Social Security surplus into a fund to extend the solvency of Medicare to at least 2020."

[Editorial, Los Angeles Times, February 8, 2000]

• John McKinnon & Greg Hitt, Wall Street Journal: Debt reduction is part of legacy

"In fact, Mr. Clinton already has secured much of that legacy by winning the political debate over three-quarters of the surplus. Following Mr. Clinton's lead, congressional leaders and the major presidential candidates now agree that the entire Social Security surplus, estimated at about \$2.2 trillion between 2001 and 2010, should be set aside for debt reduction. Mr. Clinton hopes his Social Security and debt-reduction effort will extend the trust fund's projected life from 2034 to at least 2050 and possibly 2054." [McKinnon & Hitt, Wall Street Journal, 2/8/2000]

President's Budget Makes the Right Investments

- Pittsburgh Post-Gazette: Applauds EITC, prescriptions, military spending
 - "Some of these spending increases are to be applauded, including necessary increases in military spending and programs that benefit needy Americans, such as the earned income tax credit. The president is also right to want to add drug coverage to the Medicare program." [Editorial, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, 2/9/2000]
- Washington Post: "Good for Middle Class"
 - "Most of the major initiatives in this [President Clinton's] budget would mainly help lower- and lower-middle-income people, and we support them." [Editorial, Washington Post, 2/8/2000]
- St. Louis Post-Dispatch: "Sounds right themes"
 - "President Bill Clinton proposed a \$ 1.84 trillion budget that sounded the right themes." [Editorial, <u>St. Louis</u> Post-Dispatch, 2/9/2000]
- San Francisco Chronicle: "Priorities Are Right In Clinton's Budget"
 - While some proposals in the budget, including tax increases for corporations, have been declared "dead on arrival" by GOP congressional leaders, there is much in the spending plan to recommend it, including initiatives on military pay, preschool, tax credits for the poor, child care, protection of wildlife and open spaces and gun law enforcement. It would be a shame if election-year politics stymied compromise on the budget. [Editorial, San Francisco Chronicle, 2/8/2000]
- Lancaster (PA) Intelligencer Journal: "If not now, when?"
 - "Beyond that, this is a budget that adheres to the president's agenda, and, which, if approved, will improve the lot of all Americans. It is a budget that, if followed, promises to eliminate the \$3.7 trillion in U.S. debt by the year 2013. This budget is a blueprint for the future. It raises the question by itself: If not now, when?" [Editorial, Intelligencer Journal, 2/8/2000]

Congress Will Be Forced to Take This Budget Seriously

- Stan Collender, National Journal: Republicans have to take it seriously
 - "Regardless of some of the criticism the Clinton fiscal 2001 budget has already received and the negative things that may be said about it over the next few days, the reality is that congressional Republicans will have little choice but to take much of it -- especially the appropriations proposals -- seriously." [Stan Collender, National Journal's Cloakroom, 2/8/2000]
- **Jacob Schlesinger,** *Wall Street Journal:* Fair amount of budget will survive "Despite the initial harsh reaction from GOP leaders . . . it is a good bet a fair amount of this year's budget blueprint will survive before Congress breaks for the November election." [Schlesinger, Wall Street Journal, 2/8/2000]